

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend Claim 1 as follows:

Claim 1, lines 30-31, in the definition of ZY, delete "OPR<sub>4</sub>R<sub>5</sub> PR<sub>4</sub> OR<sub>5</sub>," and "PR<sub>4</sub>SR<sub>7</sub>, NR<sub>4</sub>PR<sub>5</sub>R<sub>6</sub>, PR<sub>4</sub>NR<sub>5</sub>R<sub>7</sub>".

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 23, 1995 has rejected Claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly being non-enabling.

In response thereto, applicants have amended the claims, which, when considered with the comments hereinbelow is deemed to place the present case in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Before proceeding to the merits of the Office Action, applicants wish to thank Examiner Criares for the courtesy extended to applicants' representative during the telephone interview on June 26, 1995, for his clarification of the Office Action and for his helpful suggestions.

During the interview, Examiner Criares indicated that the claimed subject matter was being examined in its entirety. In addition, the rejection of the claimed subject matter under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, was also discussed. Examiner Criares indicated that he did not believe that compounds containing phosphorus substituents were enabled in the present application.

In accordance with Examiner Criares suggestion in the interview, applicants have deleted phosphorus containing substituents from the claimed subject matter. However, applicants have not abandoned this subject matter, and reserve the right to file a continuation application directed thereto.

In support of the rejection, the Office Action alleges that applicants have not established with a reasonable degree of certainty and expectation that the compounds of the present invention would treat CNS disorders in mammals. Applicants